

REMARKS

The application has been amended as needed so as to place it in condition for allowance at the time of the next Official Action.

In the course of this revision, subject headings have been inserted at the appropriate locations throughout the specification in a manner consistent with the preferred guidelines set forth at 37 CFR §1.77 and Section 601 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP).

An Abstract of the Disclosure is submitted herewith, which abstract is believed to fully comply with 37 CFR §1.72(b) and Section 608.01(b) of the MPEP.

Claims 1-7 were either objected to due to the presence of several informalities, or rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. The Primary Examiner's well-taken formal criticisms of these claims were borne in mind as points to be corrected when drafting the new claims. Specifically, new claims 11-17 were drafted in such a manner as to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded by applicants as their invention. When drafting the new claims, great care was taken to ensure that the terms recited therein possessed proper antecedent basis. Thus, new claims 11-17 are believed to set out and circumscribe a particular method for treating a product, with a reasonable degree of precision and

particularity, when read in light of the teachings of the original specification. It is respectfully submitted that a person having ordinary skill in the art would be reasonably apprised of the metes and bounds of new claims 11-17. Accordingly, it is believed that the rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, has been overcome and should not be applied to new claims 11-17.

It should be pointed out that applicants had filed a Preliminary Amendment, which among other things eliminated multiple dependencies. It is readily apparent from the contents of the Official Action, that such Preliminary Amendment was either not present in the Examiner's file, or was simply not considered. Nevertheless, and in order to advance prosecution of this application, as was pointed out above, claims 1-7 have been cancelled and replaced with new claims 11-17 which are believed to be patentable.

The Primary Examiner had kindly indicated that claims 1-7 would be allowable if amended to overcome the objections and rejections under 35 USC §112, second paragraph. By the present amendment, as was pointed out above, it is believed that the same has been effected with the submission of new claims 11-17.

In view of the present amendment and the foregoing remarks, therefore, it is believed that this application has been

placed in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance on the basis of new claims 11-17 are accordingly solicited.

In the event that there are any questions relating to this amendment or to the application in general, it would be appreciated if the Examiner would telephone the undersigned attorney concerning such questions so that the prosecution of this application may be expedited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON



---

Benoit Castel, Reg. No. 35,041  
745 South 23<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Arlington, VA 22202  
Telephone (703) 521-2297  
Telefax (703) 685-0573  
(703) 979-4709

BC/lk

Application No. 09/937,349  
Amdt. dated March 5, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of October 8, 2003  
Docket No. 2001-1134

**Appendix:**

The Appendix includes the following item:

- a new Abstract of the Disclosure